

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/974,760	ROBERTS ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David A. Lambertson	1636	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) David A. Lambertson.

(3) _____.

 (2) Anita Meiklejohn, Ph.D.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 July 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claim 110.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative was contacted regarding a supplemental Examiner's Amendment regarding claim 110. It appears that claim 110 inadvertently included the term "S133L" in the claim language by omitting open and closed brackets around the term (as was done in similar claims). In order to maintain consistency in the claim language, it was suggested that a supplemental Examiner's Amendment be provided to Applicant, bracketing the term "S133L," and therefore removing the term by amendment. Applicant's representative approved this amendment..